

**Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council
Bylaws Committee February 27, 2006 Meeting Minutes**

- 1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:15 PM.**
- 2. ATTENDANCE:** Bylaws Committee Members present – LJ Carusone (Committee Chair) presiding, David Buchanan, David Moring, Ivan Spiegel, Joe Murphy, Lisa M. Ezell, Steve Freedman, Stewart Oscars, Susan Rennie. Absent – Colette Bailey, Eileen Pollack Erickson, Greg Fitchitt, Jodi Gusek, Thomas O’Meara. Also attending – CJ Cole, Dante Cacace, Keith Harrison, Richard Myers.
- 3. MINUTES:** The minutes from 02-02-22 meeting were not reviewed.
- 4. PRESENTATION TASK FORCE REPORT**
 - i. Review presentation materials/order**
 - ii. Choose presenters for Feb. 28, 2006 additional GRVNC board meeting**

LJ Carusone: Directs attention to Presentation Task Force report and notes an inaccuracy that needs to be corrected in the presentation materials, which Joe Murphy agrees to correct and forward a revised version to LJ for the 060228 presentation to the Board.

There was further discussion regarding the presentation and who will present which parts. **LJ Carusone** will introduce and MC the presentation, including requesting a sense of the Board when appropriate. **David Buchanan** will present the history of the Bylaws and the Committee. **Susan Rennie** will present the alternatives considered by the Committee and the recommended alternative. At **Joe Murphy’s** request, since he felt he did not have sufficient knowledge of GRVNC history to handle specific questions that might arise, **Lisa M. Ezell** agreed to present the ARTICLE III – MEMBERSHIP, A. GRVNC Community Stakeholder definition and the ARTICLE VI – ELECTIONS, F. Credentials section; and **David Moring** agreed to present, in addition to the ARTICLE IV – BOARD OF OFFICERS, B section regarding the roles and responsibilities of the officers, the new ARTICLE VII – COMMITTEES, G. Land Use and Planning Committee section. And **David Buchanan** will present the ARTICLE VI – ELECTIONS, A. Timing section on the election timing.

Additional issues were raised that were integrated into the above presentations – transition questions (as raised by **Michael King** and others related to the fact that the Board can’t vote to extend its terms), non-staggered terms, city procedures, etc.

Scribe Note: **Joe Murphy** was later asked to provide **LJ Carusone** and **David Moring** with clean amended Bylaw and Presentation materials for distribution and use at the presentation, which he did after the meeting.

LJ Carusone: Informs Committee that **Jamico Bell** has left DONE.

LJ Carusone: Directs Committee attention to LUPC Task Force report.

(Discussion begins)

David Buchanan: Committees are internal and must report to the Board. You can use Standing Rules to create a consent calendar.

LJ Carusone: The consent calendar is not recommended by DONE.

Ivan Spiegel: LUPC matters dominate Board meetings.

David Buchanan: After being elected, Rosendahl learned that land use matters constitute over 85% of his work load.

Ivan Spiegel: Recommends that we do away with LUPC as a Committee and replace it with an advisory panel that provides analysis but does not necessarily hold hearings.

Joe Murphy: Supports the concept.

Ivan Spiegel: Indicates that this would avoid duplication and would enable the Board to make informed decisions.

LJ Carusone: He has received comments that stakeholders like the LUPC process because it gives them information earlier.

Ivan Spiegel: At the last Board meeting, there was a lot of comment questioning why matters were being heard 'a second time'.

Steve Freedman: The LUPC has always been a standing committee. Most Board members believe it's the most important GRVNC committee. Remarks that the suggestion that LUPC could do staff work is absurd. Also, most Board members initially want to be on the LUPC, but those who do often regret it.

David Buchanan: Controversial issues in LA go to PLUM where it gets heard all over again. GRVNC is purely advisory → it does not have paid staff. Where we've missed the boat, however, is in not providing an opportunity for collaboration. LUPC could perform this role. If so, developers could use the LUPC as a forum in which to present proposals and get feedback.

LJ Carusone: Mentions talking with **Ivan Spiegel** regarding the Board conducting 2 meetings per month – one the regular meeting chaired by the GRVNC President, the other the LUPC meeting chaired by the LUPC Chair.

Steve Freedman: Having two hearings is OK – it's good to present twice.

David Buchanan: **Ivan Spiegel** is raising a 'bubble problem'. The LUPC, besides performing the role of a judge, can provide an forum where developers can have an ongoing sounding board, which is good. And the Board is going to have to develop trust in the LUPC →

the LUPC needs to provide balanced information and recommendations.

CJ Cole: Likes what we're coming up with and states candidly that she does not trust the current LUPC because she believes they all have agendas.

Joe Murphy: Echoes CJ Cole's comment regarding lack of trust in the current LUPC, indicating that the perception is that your real objective is to get past an unfavorable LUPC decision so that you can get before the full Board where you believe you are more likely to get a more favorable decision – but regardless, the entire process is laden with these unfortunate political overtones that the proposed LUPC could mitigate considerably, which would give the Board better and more impartial information – and this would enhance its credibility and influence.

Richard Myers: District Reps are not doing LUPC work.

David Buchanan: It comes down to what the report is. The problem is not structural, it's a question of delivery of information → standing rules could provide a template format for LUPC reports that would provide the information.

Richard Myers: The Board could insist on a report which, if not provided, would preclude the issue from being placed on the agenda.

Joe Murphy: It's the report, certainly. But it's not just that. It's also a matter of trusting the LUPC, and that is structural.

Keith Harrison: Do you want to consider having LUPC votes tallied by name?

David Moring: Likes the theme of achieving consensus.

Steve Freedman: Maybe knowing who voted how would be helpful.

David Buchanan: The proposed LUPC makeup is going to be appointments → perhaps selection process should shield them from public comment?

LJ Carusone: Indicates preference to hear about them.

Ivan Spiegel: Moves:

That public comment be submitted in writing.

Motion fails for lack of a second.

CJ Cole: Who votes for whom has to be public.

Joe Murphy: Should board members be excluded from being appointed?

(David Buchanan departs)

At this point, the Committee considered each paragraph of the proposed LUPC Committee as presented by the LUPC Task Force and amended at the prior Bylaws Committee meeting and made further amendments as follows (**changes are in bold blue print**):

The Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee will be an elected 2 year position, to coincide with the general elections.

The committee will consist of 9 11 people including the chair.

All committee members must be GRVNC stakeholders and cannot be members of the current Board with the exception of the Land Use and Planning Committee Chair.

Eight Ten of the committee members will be selected by the board from a pool of candidates who have formally communicated their desire to serve to the Board.

The Board will within 30 days of being certified hold a public meeting solely for the selection of Land Use and Planning Committee members.

~~Candidates will submit a statement/bio/CV of no more than 500 words to the members of the Board no less than 5 days prior to the special meeting.~~

~~At this meeting the Board will take statements of no more than 4 minutes from each of the prospective members and public comment of not more than 2 minutes per speaker from the general public.~~

Board members will select from a prepared ballot list no more than eight ten people to serve on the LUPC. The 8 10 highest vote getters will be selected.

A Land Use and Planning Committee member may be removed from service by a 2/3 majority of the board the full GRVNC Board. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner that committee members were originally selected. i.e., notification of intent, special meeting etc.

~~Each confirmed committee member will, by drawing numbers from a hat, be assigned to monitor one of the eight sub-areas delineated within the Venice Specific Plan.~~

~~Each committee member will report to the LUPC concerning all projects within that designated area.~~

~~Decisions of the Committee can be reconsidered by the GRVNC Board if and only if seven members of the Board call for reconsideration of a particular PLUC decision at the next Board meeting.~~

~~Projects to be reconsidered will be moved to the next~~

~~**Board meeting at which time the entire project, including project presentation and public comment will be taken and reviewed by the Board.**~~

The Land Use and Planning Committee recommendations to the Board shall be in the form of a written report including the project description, pros & cons, summary of community input, and findings, if any, by the committee.

Ivan Spiegel: Moves to add the following provision:

That projects that comply with the VSP development standards shall not qualify for consideration by the LUPC.

Keith Harrison: The Board reviews all matters that are pertinent to the community.

Joe Murphy: Although attracted to the thought, he indicates that the issue is a bit more subtle than this and that there is value in the constructive exchange of ideas and the input that can come from hearing LUPC and neighbor concerns and comments is valuable and does affect project design – often improving it. Therefore he would oppose the motion.

Motion fails for lack of a second.

LJ Carusone: Moves adoption of the amendments to the functions of the proposed LUPC Committee.

Steve Freedman: Seconds the motion.

The question being called and determined by voice vote as follows:

For	9
Opposed	0
Abstain	0

Motion passes

(Discussion ends)

LJ Carusone: Directs Committee attention to the function of the LUPC Chair.

David Moring: Reviews the functions as previously adopted by the Committee:

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee

(Remaining LUPC Chair duties to be developed as the LUPC language is finalized. May include:

- Chief liaison for LUPC with GRVNC Board of Officers and Venice community
- Provide reports to LUPC and GRVNC Board of Officers that tracks land use project in Venice
- Works with President and VP to present Community Impact Reports to LA City planning officials
- Inform stakeholders of the impact of land use projects in Venice
- Orient all new LUPC members on the land use planning and approval process in LA City)

(Discussion begins)

David Moring: Moves that the following amendments be adopted:

7. Land Use and Planning Committee Chair

- Chair of the Land Use and Planning Committee
- Responsible for all required reports to the Board

~~*(Remaining LUPC Chair duties to be developed as the LUPC language is finalized. May include:*~~

- ~~— Chief liaison for LUPC with GRVNC Board of Officers and Venice community~~
- ~~— Provide reports to LUPC and GRVNC Board of Officers that tracks land use project in Venice~~
- ~~— Works with President and VP to present Community Impact Reports to LA City planning officials~~
- ~~— Inform stakeholders of the impact of land use projects in Venice~~
- ~~— Orient all new LUPC members on the land use planning and approval process in LA City)~~

Joe Murphy: Seconds the motion.

The question was called and, by unanimous (8) voice vote:

Motion passes

(Discussion ends)

LJ Carusone: Appoints a Drafting Task Force to include **David Moring** (Chair), **LJ Carusone**, **CJ Cole**, **David Buchanan**, and **Joe Murphy**.

5. **NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA:** The date, time, location and agenda of the next meeting will be provided by the Chair following the presentation to the Board scheduled for February 28, 2006
6. **ADJOURNMENT:** 9:15pm motion by chair to adjourn is passed by consensus.